THE PRADE

2-26-07

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

	U.S. F	Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031 atent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no pe	Application Number	ection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.
TRANSMITTAL	Filing Date	1/2/10/2001
FORM	First Named Inventor	Leonard Duffer
	Art Unit	3677
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Examiner Name	James R. Brittain
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	Attorney Docket Number	
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
	1	After Allowance Communication to TC
Fee Transmittal Form	」 Drawing(s) □	Appeal Communication to Board
Fee Attached	Licensing-related Papers	of Appeals and Interferences
Amendment/Reply	Petition	Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
After Final	Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	Proprietary Information
Affidavits/declaration(s)	Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence A	
Extension of Time Request	Terminal Disclaimer	Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify below):
	Request for Refund	Delow).
Express Abandonment Request	CD, Number of CD(s)	
Information Disclosure Statement	Landscape Table on CD	
Certified Copy of Priority R	emarks	
Document(s)	<u> </u>	
Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application		
Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53		
	•	
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT		
Firm Name Swittporder Research + Development, LLC		
Signature Signature		
Printed name		
ternand lufy		
1 Feb 22,	1007	Reg. No. No.
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING		
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in apvenyelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on		
the date shown below: Signature		
Typed or printed name Lean and Duffy Date 10/22/07		

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

DATE: 22 February, 2007

TO: Commissioner of Patents

US Patent and Trademark Office

P.O. Box 1450

Arlington, VA 22313-1450

Attn: James R. Brittain, Examiner

Art Unit 3677

Transmitted via US Express Mail # EQ 627181016

RE: Improved Slidingly Engaging Fasteners and Method

Leonard Duffy, Inventor

P.O. Box 99

Hinesburg, VT 05461-0099

Sir:

The following is respectfully submitted in response to the Office Action of 01/10/2007.

This response comprises:

Summary of Interview

Amended Claims

Summary and Discussion

Conclusion

Respectfully submitted,

Leonard Duffy, applicant pro se



APPLICANT'S SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE INTERVIEW: 02 FEBRUARY 2007

Applicant requested clarification regarding procedure at this stage as well as regarding substance of claims and possible amendments. It is now understood that <u>no</u> previously withdrawn claims have been considered because not all were in proper form regarding the limits of the presently allowable generic claims. Examiner also noted that all amendments at this stage must be clearly allowable based on matter seen before.

Applicant indicated his intention to amend rejected claim 48 as directed in the OA.

Applicant indicated his intention to amend previously withdraw claims to clearly include all of the limitations of allowable generic claims.

Applicant indicated his intention to amend or cancel rejected claims 34, 44, 47, and 60 so that they each include all of the limitations of an allowed generic claim. Examiner indicated that amendments would be considered.

Applicant queried whether any of the withdrawn claims presented a problem. Claims 7 and 8 were discussed in particular. After considerable discussion and consideration, examiner indicated that Claim 8 (referring to stem segments conjoined into a singular stem as in Figs 1,3,7,8, and 10) should be allowable. However, Claim 7 (referring to Fig. 5) may be a problem as written as dependent on Claim 1, regarding the definition of terminology.

Regarding amending rejected claims, Examiner suggested that including the limitations of allowed generic claims other than #1 should be considered.

Examiner indicated that minor changes after next response may be handled by examiner's amendment after consultation by telephone.

End Summary of Interview.